

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

TARIE HASSAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 14-14407

COMMISSIONER OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER FOR RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS**

Plaintiff on December 21, 2015, filed timely objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation in the above-entitled matter. Plaintiff argues that the court should not adopt the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation, and the case should be remanded for an award of benefits or further proceedings. Defendant was directed by the magistrate judge to file a response to objections within fourteen days of Defendant's receipt of objections, commensurate in length and complexity with any such objections.

The court received "Defendant's Response" (Dkt. # 21), which was filed very promptly, only one day after the Plaintiff's filing. The court notes, however, that it does not, in fact, *respond* to the four stated objections. The response, in its entirety, says that "[f]or the reasons stated both in the RR and defendant's brief to the Magistrate Judge, plaintiff's arguments are without merit."

While this observation may be revealed ultimately as a correct assessment, it is singularly unhelpful in attempting to evaluate the Report and Recommendation. It is a

dismissive statement that shirks a litigant's opportunity —responsibility, more accurately— to assist the court in assessing the arguments presented. The court is keenly aware of the burgeoning caseload of Social Security Disability claims, and the time pressures under which attorneys in the Department of Justice must operate. The court commonly grants reasonable extensions of time when asked; the court does not expect law review articles in response to meritless objections; the court regularly chastens objecting parties when they cast patently meritless “objections” as “relying on the arguments presented in the briefs,” etc. Upon initial review of the objections, this does not appear to be such a case. The court does not intend to study the case independently any further in the absence of Defendant's reaction. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendant file a written response, addressing *specifically*, and *in the same order* raised, each issue contained within the objections. Such response must be filed not later than **February 8, 2016**.

s/Robert H. Cleland  
ROBERT H. CLELAND  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: January 18, 2016

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, January 18, 2016, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa Wagner  
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk  
(313) 234-5522